

October 4, 2002

TO: Members of the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: George Pettit, Gilbert, Chairman

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Tuesday, October 15, 2002 - 10:00 a.m..  
MAG Office, Suite 200, Saguaro Room  
302 North 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, Phoenix

A meeting of the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee (POPTAC) will be held at the time and place noted above.

Members of the POPTAC may attend **either in person, by telephone conference call or by videoconference** **To videoconference to the meeting, prior arrangements need to be made with Heidi Pahl at MAG.** Those attending by telephone conference call are requested to call 602-261-7510 between 9:55 a.m. and 10:00 a.m. After prompting, please enter the meeting ID number 767822 (POPTAC) on your telephone key pad followed by the pound key. If you have a problem or require assistance, dial 0 after calling the number above.

If you are driving, please park in the garage under the Compass Bank Building. Bring your ticket to the meeting, parking will be validated. For those using transit, the RPTA will provide transit tickets for your trip. For those using bicycles, please lock your bicycle in the bike rack in the garage.

Please be advised that under procedures approved by the MAG Regional Council on June 26, 1996, all MAG committees need to have a quorum to conduct business. A quorum is a simple majority of the membership, or 12 people for the MAG POPTAC. If you are unable to attend the meeting, please make arrangements for a proxy from your jurisdiction to represent you. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Harry Wolfe at (602) 254-6300.

#### TENTATIVE AGENDA

1. Call to Order

2. Call to the Audience

Persons wishing to address the MAG POPTAC will be provided an opportunity to comment.

#### COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED

2. For information.

3. Approval of Minutes of September 17, 2002

4. Census 2000

At the September 17, 2002 MAG POPTAC meeting, a demonstration was given on how to extract Census 2000 data from the Census Bureau Website. MAG will discuss: sources for obtaining Census data in addition to the Census Bureau Website and discuss methods for extracting Census geography for MAG member agencies. Additional census tables by place from Summary File 3 will also be distributed at the meeting. Other issues to be discussed include, but are not limited to: the timing on additional Census products, such as the Census Transportation Planning Package; the September 2003 deadline for submitting challenges to Census 2000 population figures under the Count Question Resolution Program; and the release of Urbanized-Area maps on the Census Bureau Website. A representative of the Census Bureau will be available via video conference to answer questions regarding Census 2000.

5. Status of a 2005 Special Census

In September MAG staff met again with Intergovernmental Coordinators to discuss a 2005 Special Census and potential alternatives to a Special Census including undertaking a survey for calculating 2005 population. The 2005 numbers could potentially be used for distributing state shared revenue. It is estimated that a survey would cost \$5 million compared with the \$30 million for a Special Census. MAG staff will review a briefing paper that explores the issues associated with pursuing a 2005 Special Census, versus conducting a survey for deriving state-shared revenues. Please see Attachment One.

3. Review and approve meeting minutes of September 17, 2002.

4. For information and discussion.

5. For information and discussion.

6. Preparation of New MAG Socioeconomic Projections

On September 23, 2002 MAG staff forwarded to POPTAC members the website address that conveys the first draft socioeconomic projections for 2000, 2010, 2020, 2030, 2040 and buildout and requested comments by October 4, 2002. MAG staff will take the comments received and incorporate them into a second draft of the projections. These projections will be used as input for the Long Range Transportation Plan. MAG staff will develop a set of projections for adoption by the MAG Regional Council in the spring of 2003. A status report will be provided.

7. July 1, 2002 Resident Population Updates for MAG Municipalities

On September 17, 2002 the MAG POPTAC recommended approval of the July 1, 2002 Municipality Resident Population Updates for MAG member agencies. In response to requests from MAG POPTAC members we are providing tables identifying the number of units, occupancy rates and persons per occupied unit by unit type for 2000. These data were used in calculating the July 1, 2002 Municipality Resident Population Updates. We are also providing for comparison purposes the occupancy rates and persons per household derived from the 1995 Special Census. MAG staff will review the data and respond to questions from committee members. (Please see Attachment Two).

8. GIS Day

Geographic Information System (GIS) Day corresponds with the November 15, 2002 meeting of the MAG Management Committee. This provides MAG and member agencies with an excellent opportunity to display our GIS products. Hopefully member agencies will participate in GIS Day by providing samples of their GIS products for display. An e-mail was forwarded to members of the MAG POPTAC yesterday requesting information by October

6. For information and discussion.

7. For information and discussion.

8. For information and discussion.

31, 2002 on the types of GIS products you wish to display. We also requested a response to a brief survey on your GIS activities by October 15, 2002. Please see Attachment Three.

9. Next Meeting of MAG POPTAC

The next meeting of the MAG POPTAC will be held Tuesday, November 19, 2002 at 10:00 a.m.

10. Adjournment

9. For information and discussion.

## **Attachment One**

### **Alternatives for State Shared Revenue Allocation 2005**

#### **1. 1995 State Legislation Background**

- Prior to 1994, state law provided for distributing state-shared revenue based upon a
  - Decennial Census; or a
  - Special Census in the fifth year following a Decennial Census
- For 1995 only, state law allowed two other options for distributing state-shared revenue in lieu of conducting a Special Census. The options were as follows:
  - Use the 1995 DES resident population estimate.
    - < Cities with more than 50,000 people and counties with more than 125,000 people would be required to contract with DES for a sample survey to verify the existing housing stock, vacancy rate and persons per household. DES ultimately allowed Tucson to contract with the Census Bureau. The information collected in the survey would be used in calculating the local 1995 population level for the jurisdiction in question
    - < All other cities, towns and counties could submit the estimates developed by DES without any surveys.
    - < No appeal to the determination of the July 1, 1995 estimates determined by the DES population technical advisory committee to the department of economic security would be allowed.
  - Use 1990 Census, even if the jurisdiction has conducted a Special Census.

#### **2. Special Census 2005 Requirements**

- MAG/MAG member agencies
  - Submit a formal request to the Census Bureau along with a \$200 fee for preparing an official cost estimate for undertaking a Special Census.
  - Contract with the Census Bureau for undertaking a Special Census.
  - Hire 7,600 enumerators and handle associated payroll.
  - Provide a list of Group Quarters to Census Bureau
  - Provide the Census Bureau with a complete inventory of addresses
  - Publicize the Special Census
  - Pay for the Special Census
- Census Bureau
  - Set up administrative procedures and offices

- Dispatch Census staff to Phoenix area to administer the census
  - Conduct the enumeration
  - Process the data collected
  - Provide reports, tabulations and data with the results of the enumeration at a minimum level of the enumeration district
- Issues
    - Census Bureau generally requires a 5:1 ratio of enumerators interviewed to the number that need to be available. This would require us to interview about 38,000 enumerators.
    - Any jurisdiction can contract individually with the Census Bureau.
    - The methods for carrying out a new Special Census are undergoing changes and have not been fully defined.
    - The Bureau has never carried out an attempt to count 3.6 million people. Even with the amount of money spent, there could be a substantial undercount.
    - The Office of the Special Census has indicated that we would NOT have an opportunity to review the address lists that they would use to conduct the Census, which was afforded during the 2000 Census.
    - If a large number of jurisdictions in the State contracted separately with the Census Bureau, it might be logistically difficult to carry out the Specials in the single year.
    - In 1995, the Special Census count was used to distribute state-shared revenue regardless of when the Special Census was taken during the year. Thus, jurisdictions that conducted a Special Census in October 2005 would have six more months of growth than jurisdictions conducting the Special Census in April 2005.

### 3. Survey Requirements

- MAG/Member Agencies
  - Contract to carry out the survey
  - Provide a list of Group Quarters to survey organization
  - Compile a complete inventory of addresses from which the Census Bureau would draw a sample
  - Publicize the survey
  - Pay for the survey
- Survey Organization
  - Execute contract and begin work by April 2004
  - Have survey approved for distribution (if survey done by Census Bureau, must be cleared by OMB)
  - Draw sample from inventory of addresses provided by MAG member agencies.
  - Ensure differentiation between resident and non-resident population
  - Hire and train interviewers
  - Dispatch interviewers to conduct the survey
  - Process results of the survey
  - Conduct a complete count of population in Group Quarters

- Provide reports and tabulations for population in households, population in Group Quarters, total number of housing units and total number of occupied housing units
- Issues
  - Potential for survey error could give rise to dissatisfaction with the results of the survey.
  - Surveys traditionally result in a larger undercount of minority populations than a Census.
  - The use of the survey results for determining the 2005 population estimate would need to be clearly defined in state legislation. In 1995 Tucson had difficulty interfacing with DES over the application of their survey results in deriving their estimate.
  - Surveys are not as familiar to the general public as a Census. As a result people may be reticent to respond to the survey or to provide accurate information. Publicity is vital to getting a good response.
  - The sample size for small cities would be disproportionately higher than for larger cities based upon their population. For example Phoenix would require a sample size of 2,525; while Surprise's sample size would be 2,425.
  - If the Census Bureau is the survey organization, it would require that each jurisdiction participating in the survey sign a formal agreement acknowledging that the counts are not official.

#### 4. Cost Considerations

- Cost of the survey would vary from \$2.5 million to \$5 million dollars for the region
- Cost of the survey could be more on a per capita basis if not all member agencies decided to pursue this option.
- Cost of a Special Census would be about \$8.33 to \$10.00 per capita or \$30 million for the entire region.
- Cost of a Special Census could be more on a per capita basis if not all member agencies decided to pursue this option.
- It is likely that FHWA will contribute up to \$6 million of the cost of a Special Census for the region, leaving member agencies to cover the estimated \$24 million remainder with local funds.
- It is likely that FHWA will contribute 50% of the cost of a survey for the region, leaving member agencies to cover the estimated \$1.25 to \$2.5 million with local funds.
- It is likely that FHWA will only contribute funds to cover the cost of a Special Census or a Survey if the entire region pursues the option. If individual cities choose to do a survey or a Special Census, no federal funds will defray the cost.
- MAG member agencies would need to bear the cost of publicizing either a survey or a Special Census.

## **ATTACHMENT TWO**

**Table 1 - Summary Page of July 1, 2002 Updates**

**Table 2 - Census 2000 Housing Units by Type and Population**

**Table 3 - Comparison of 1995 and 2000 Occupancy Rates and Persons Per Occupied Unit**

**Table 4 - Net Housing Unit Completion and Annexation Information**

**Table 5 - July 1, 2002 Housing Units By Type**

**Table 6- July 1, 2002 Occupancy Rates and Persons Per Occupied Unit**



# JULY 1, 2002 MUNICIPALITY POPULATION AND HOUSING UNIT UPDATE

TABLE 1  
DRAFT

DRAFT

## MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

Jurisdiction	Year 2000 Census (April 1, 2000)					Net Units 4/01/2000 - 6/30/2002	Population from new Units	Annexations		July 1, 2002 Effective		July 1, 2002 Update			
	Population			Housing Units				Population	Housing Units	Pop. Per Occupied Unit	Occupancy Rate	Population			Total Housing Units
	Total	Household	Group Quarter	Total	Occupied							Household	Group Quarter	Total (Round to 5)	
Apache Junction *	273	273	0	328	163	0	0	0	0	1.67	0.50	273	0	275	328
Avondale	35,883	35,737	146	11,419	10,640	3,706	11,721	7	2	3.34	0.94	47,465	146	47,610	15,127
Buckeye	8,497	6,528	1,969	2,344	2,158	509	1,160	37	12	2.93	0.92	7,726	4,230	11,955	2,865
Carefree	2,927	2,927	0	1,769	1,389	155	221	0	0	2.09	0.78	3,148	0	3,150	1,924
Cave Creek	3,728	3,728	0	1,753	1,571	145	295	0	0	2.37	0.90	4,023	0	4,025	1,898
Chandler	176,581	175,799	782	66,592	62,377	7,136	17,669	65	23	2.80	0.94	193,533	856	194,390	73,751
El Mirage	7,609	7,608	1	3,162	2,121	3,960	13,033	5	5	3.59	0.81	20,646	0	20,645	7,127
Fountain Hills	20,235	20,228	7	10,491	8,653	725	1,354	0	0	2.33	0.83	21,582	159	21,740	11,216
Gila Bend	1,980	1,980	0	766	659	13	35	0	0	3.01	0.86	2,015	0	2,015	779
Gila River	2,699	2,654	45	685	629	10	41	0	0	4.22	0.92	2,695	45	2,740	695
Gilbert	109,697	109,631	66	37,007	35,405	8,402	23,938	6	2	3.07	0.96	133,576	66	133,640	45,411
Glendale	218,812	215,955	2,857	79,667	75,700	3,435	8,676	6	2	2.85	0.95	224,637	2,857	227,495	83,104
Goodyear	18,911	16,541	2,370	6,771	6,179	3,231	7,630	0	0	2.65	0.91	24,171	2,545	26,715	10,002
Guadalupe	5,228	5,220	8	1,184	1,110	24	105	0	0	4.70	0.94	5,325	0	5,325	1,208
Litchfield Park	3,810	3,780	30	1,633	1,508	18	40	0	0	2.51	0.92	3,820	30	3,850	1,651
Mesa	396,375	392,426	3,949	175,701	146,643	12,256	29,955	1,219	431	2.68	0.84	423,600	3,949	427,550	188,388
Paradise Valley	13,664	13,652	12	5,499	5,034	181	424	0	0	2.71	0.92	14,076	12	14,090	5,680
Peoria *	108,363	106,849	1,514	42,570	39,183	5,844	14,237	0	0	2.71	0.92	121,086	1,568	122,655	48,414
Phoenix	1,321,045	1,298,577	22,468	495,832	465,834	18,039	44,281	26	9	2.78	0.94	1,342,884	22,791	1,365,675	513,880
Queen Creek *	4,197	4,197	0	1,229	1,172	364	1,143	0	0	3.52	0.95	5,340	94	5,435	1,593
Salt River	6,405	6,355	50	2,526	1,959	91	324	0	0	3.27	0.78	6,679	50	6,730	2,617
Scottsdale	202,705	201,028	1,677	104,974	90,669	6,380	11,378	4	2	2.21	0.86	212,411	1,677	214,090	111,356
Surprise	30,848	30,724	124	16,260	12,484	7,052	14,277	0	0	2.44	0.79	45,001	124	45,125	23,312
Tempe	158,625	153,383	5,242	67,068	63,602	377	762	0	0	2.41	0.95	154,145	5,280	159,425	67,445
Tolleson	4,974	4,974	0	1,485	1,432	21	76	0	0	3.48	0.96	5,050	0	5,050	1,506
Wickenburg	5,082	5,039	43	2,691	2,341	83	181	7	3	2.16	0.87	5,227	271	5,500	2,777
Youngtown	3,010	2,857	153	1,783	1,641	153	200	0	0	1.72	0.92	3,057	238	3,295	1,936
Unin-New River	10,740	10,695	45	4,514	3,921	61	135	0	0	2.72	0.87	10,830	45	10,875	4,575
Unin-Rio Verde	1,419	1,419	0	1,168	761	61	69	0	0	1.86	0.65	1,488	0	1,490	1,229
Unin-Sun City	38,309	37,641	668	27,731	23,490	276	363	0	0	1.60	0.85	38,004	668	38,670	28,007
Unin-Sun City West	26,344	26,083	261	17,359	14,997	101	177	0	0	1.74	0.86	26,260	261	26,520	17,460
Unin-Sun Lakes	11,936	11,936	0	7,746	6,683	579	855	0	0	1.78	0.86	12,791	0	12,790	8,325
Unin-Other	111,238	110,942	296	48,524	40,778	6,600	15,666	-1,383	-491	2.71	0.85	125,225	490	125,715	54,633
Total	3,072,149	3,027,366	44,783	1,250,231	1,132,886	89,988	220,432	0	0	2.67	0.91	3,247,798	48,452	3,296,250	1,340,219

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

\* Maricopa County portion only. Total Year 2000 Census population: Peoria = 108,364 , Queen Creek = 4,316  
Total July 1, 2002 population: Peoria = 122,656 , Queen Creek = 5,459

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census Year 2000 Census, Arizona Department of Economic Security, Maricopa Association of Governments Residential Completion database.

Prepared by the Maricopa Association of Governments, September 2002.

**YEAR 2000 CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING**  
**Resident Housing Unit and Population Information by Municipality**  
**MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

**TABLE 2**

Jurisdiction	Total Resident Housing Units (April 1, 2000)				Occupied Resident Housing Units (April 1, 2000)				Population (April 1, 2000)					
	Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Total	Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Total	Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Pop. In Households	Pop. in Grp. Qrts.	TOTAL
Apache Junction *	0	185	143	328	0	89	74	163	0	155	118	273	0	273
Avondale	8,599	1,581	1,239	11,419	8,255	1,234	1,151	10,640	28,582	3,149	4,006	35,737	146	35,883
Buckeye	1,284	451	609	2,344	1,212	418	528	2,158	4,182	942	1,404	6,528	1,969	8,497
Carefree	1,604	163	2	1,769	1,269	118	2	1,389	2,751	171	5	2,927	0	2,927
Cave Creek	1,449	181	123	1,753	1,332	155	84	1,571	3,193	360	175	3,728	0	3,728
Chandler	50,762	13,669	2,161	66,592	48,788	11,754	1,835	62,377	144,270	26,514	5,015	175,799	782	176,581
El Mirage	1,627	322	1,213	3,162	1,498	273	350	2,121	5,664	960	984	7,608	1	7,609
Fountain Hills	8,102	2,389	0	10,491	7,202	1,451	0	8,653	17,694	2,534	0	20,228	7	20,235
Gila Bend	428	100	238	766	368	88	203	659	1,023	254	703	1,980	0	1,980
Gila River	527	39	119	685	511	33	85	629	2,268	119	267	2,654	45	2,699
Gilbert	33,304	3,569	134	37,007	31,986	3,292	127	35,405	101,821	7,405	405	109,631	66	109,697
Glendale	51,924	22,775	4,968	79,667	50,527	20,675	4,498	75,700	156,874	48,142	10,939	215,955	2,857	218,812
Goodyear	5,879	575	317	6,771	5,340	522	317	6,179	14,415	1,319	807	16,541	2,370	18,911
Guadalupe	971	93	120	1,184	909	90	111	1,110	4,472	238	510	5,220	8	5,228
Litchfield Park	1,529	104	0	1,633	1,425	83	0	1,508	3,566	214	0	3,780	30	3,810
Mesa	95,457	47,196	33,048	175,701	89,210	40,806	16,627	146,643	269,215	91,328	31,883	392,426	3,949	396,375
Paradise Valley	5,477	15	7	5,499	5,012	15	7	5,034	13,599	30	23	13,652	12	13,664
Peoria *	33,392	5,047	4,131	42,570	31,793	4,199	3,191	39,183	92,511	7,574	6,764	106,849	1,514	108,363
Phoenix	311,575	162,461	21,796	495,832	301,382	145,394	19,058	465,834	911,008	337,737	49,832	1,298,577	22,468	1,321,045
Queen Creek *	986	0	243	1,229	944	0	228	1,172	3,349	0	848	4,197	0	4,197
Salt River	1,033	15	1,478	2,526	1,022	15	922	1,959	4,496	43	1,816	6,355	50	6,405
Scottsdale	71,301	32,656	1,017	104,974	63,411	26,429	829	90,669	153,139	46,194	1,695	201,028	1,677	202,705
Surprise	12,056	1,378	2,826	16,260	10,185	829	1,470	12,484	25,713	1,724	3,287	30,724	124	30,848
Tempe	36,722	27,620	2,726	67,068	35,734	25,390	2,478	63,602	95,836	51,673	5,874	153,383	5,242	158,625
Tolleson	1,165	280	40	1,485	1,165	227	40	1,432	4,402	485	87	4,974	0	4,974
Wickenburg	1,501	594	596	2,691	1,367	507	467	2,341	3,362	950	727	5,039	43	5,082
Youngtown	1,236	537	10	1,783	1,145	496	0	1,641	2,121	736	0	2,857	153	3,010
Unin-New River	3,969	17	528	4,514	3,421	12	488	3,921	9,593	41	1,061	10,695	45	10,740
Unin-Rio Verde	1,168	0	0	1,168	761	0	0	761	1,419	0	0	1,419	0	1,419
Unin-Sun City	23,397	4,248	86	27,731	19,524	3,883	83	23,490	32,180	5,345	116	37,641	668	38,309
Unin-Sun City West	16,264	1,085	10	17,359	14,118	869	10	14,997	24,872	1,192	19	26,083	261	26,344
Unin-Sun Lakes	6,685	73	988	7,746	5,718	73	892	6,683	10,451	96	1,389	11,936	0	11,936
Unin-Other	29,825	2,643	16,056	48,524	27,588	2,280	10,910	40,778	78,935	4,435	27,572	110,942	296	111,238
<b>Total</b>	<b>821,198</b>	<b>332,061</b>	<b>96,972</b>	<b>1,250,231</b>	<b>774,122</b>	<b>291,699</b>	<b>67,065</b>	<b>1,132,886</b>	<b>2,226,976</b>	<b>642,059</b>	<b>158,331</b>	<b>3,027,366</b>	<b>44,783</b>	<b>3,072,149</b>

\* Maricopa County portion only.

Note: Total Housing Units and Population consistent with full Census count.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census Year 2000 Census.

Prepared by the Maricopa Association of Governments, September 2002.

**YEAR 1995 AND YEAR 2000 CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING**  
**Comparison of Occupancy Rates and Population per Occupied Housing Unit by Municipality**  
**MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

TABLE 3

Jurisdiction	Occupancy Rates												Population per Occupied Unit											
	Single Family			Multi-Family			Other			Total			Single Family			Multi-Family			Other			Total		
	1995	2000	Change	1995	2000	Change	1995	2000	Change	1995	2000	Change	1995	2000	Change	1995	2000	Change	1995	2000	Change	1995	2000	Change
Apache Junction *	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.48	-0.52	0.37	0.52	0.15	0.38	0.50	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	1.74	-0.26	1.70	1.59	-0.11	1.69	1.67	-0.02
Avondale	0.94	0.96	0.02	0.88	0.78	-0.10	0.90	0.93	0.03	0.92	0.93	0.01	3.56	3.46	-0.09	2.87	2.55	-0.32	3.10	3.48	0.38	3.36	3.36	0.00
Buckeye	0.93	0.94	0.01	0.88	0.93	0.04	0.82	0.87	0.04	0.90	0.92	0.02	3.13	3.39	0.26	2.68	2.25	-0.43	2.91	2.66	-0.26	2.98	3.03	0.04
Carefree	0.74	0.79	0.05	0.76	0.72	-0.03	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.74	0.79	0.04	2.15	2.15	0.00	1.46	1.45	-0.01	0.00	2.50	2.50	2.07	2.11	0.03
Cave Creek	0.93	0.92	-0.01	0.74	0.86	0.12	0.83	0.68	-0.15	0.88	0.90	0.01	2.55	2.43	-0.12	2.04	2.32	0.28	2.41	2.08	-0.32	2.46	2.37	-0.09
Chandler	0.95	0.96	0.01	0.88	0.86	-0.02	0.86	0.85	-0.01	0.93	0.94	0.01	3.00	2.96	-0.04	2.39	2.26	-0.14	2.45	2.73	0.29	2.87	2.82	-0.05
El Mirage	0.94	0.92	-0.02	0.92	0.85	-0.07	0.48	0.29	-0.19	0.82	0.67	-0.15	4.17	3.83	-0.34	3.73	3.52	-0.21	2.74	2.81	0.07	3.88	3.59	-0.29
Fountain Hills	0.87	0.89	0.02	0.55	0.61	0.05	1.00	0.00	-1.00	0.81	0.82	0.01	2.53	2.46	-0.07	2.04	1.75	-0.29	1.86	0.00	-1.86	2.47	2.34	-0.13
Gila Bend	0.83	0.86	0.03	0.92	0.88	-0.04	0.74	0.85	0.11	0.83	0.86	0.03	3.04	2.83	-0.21	2.99	2.89	-0.10	2.88	3.46	0.59	3.01	3.00	-0.01
Gila River	0.85	0.97	0.12	0.96	0.85	-0.11	0.72	0.71	-0.01	0.84	0.92	0.08	4.23	4.46	0.24	2.39	3.61	1.21	3.47	3.14	-0.32	3.99	4.22	0.23
Gilbert	0.95	0.96	0.02	0.87	0.92	0.05	0.97	0.95	-0.03	0.93	0.96	0.02	3.27	3.18	-0.08	2.36	2.25	-0.11	2.69	3.19	0.50	3.14	3.10	-0.04
Glendale	0.96	0.97	0.01	0.89	0.91	0.02	0.91	0.91	0.00	0.94	0.95	0.01	3.06	3.11	0.05	2.28	2.33	0.05	2.14	2.43	0.29	2.80	2.85	0.05
Goodyear	0.88	0.91	0.02	0.93	0.91	-0.03	0.85	1.00	0.15	0.89	0.91	0.02	2.83	2.73	-0.10	2.62	2.53	-0.09	2.77	2.55	-0.23	2.79	2.68	-0.12
Guadalupe	0.95	0.94	-0.01	0.97	0.97	0.00	0.89	0.93	0.03	0.94	0.94	-0.01	4.52	4.92	0.40	4.20	2.64	-1.55	3.92	4.59	0.67	4.43	4.70	0.27
Litchfield Park	0.93	0.93	0.00	0.96	0.80	-0.16	0.83	0.00	-0.83	0.93	0.92	-0.01	2.58	2.50	-0.08	2.48	2.58	0.10	2.00	0.00	-2.00	2.58	2.51	-0.07
Mesa	0.92	0.93	0.01	0.87	0.86	-0.01	0.45	0.50	0.06	0.82	0.83	0.01	3.03	3.01	-0.02	2.22	2.24	0.02	1.89	1.92	0.02	2.67	2.68	0.01
Paradise Valley	0.89	0.92	0.03	0.73	1.00	0.27	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.89	0.92	0.03	2.70	2.69	-0.02	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	3.29	3.29	2.70	2.71	0.01
Peoria *	0.94	0.95	0.01	0.89	0.83	-0.06	0.76	0.77	0.02	0.91	0.92	0.01	2.90	2.90	0.00	1.80	1.80	0.00	1.95	2.12	0.17	2.70	2.73	0.03
Phoenix	0.95	0.97	0.01	0.89	0.89	0.01	0.87	0.87	0.01	0.93	0.94	0.01	2.91	3.02	0.11	2.24	2.32	0.08	2.24	2.61	0.38	2.68	2.79	0.11
Queen Creek *	0.96	0.96	-0.01	1.00	0.00	-1.00	0.95	0.94	-0.01	0.96	0.95	-0.01	3.52	3.49	-0.03	4.25	0.00	-4.25	3.38	3.72	0.34	3.49	3.58	0.09
Salt River	0.95	0.99	0.03	0.93	1.00	0.07	0.70	0.62	-0.07	0.80	0.78	-0.03	4.14	4.39	0.25	1.92	2.87	0.95	2.04	1.97	-0.07	3.05	3.24	0.19
Scottsdale	0.89	0.89	0.00	0.81	0.81	0.00	0.79	0.82	0.03	0.86	0.86	0.00	2.45	2.42	-0.03	1.83	1.75	-0.08	1.64	2.04	0.41	2.24	2.22	-0.02
Surprise	0.80	0.84	0.04	0.57	0.60	0.03	0.44	0.52	0.08	0.65	0.77	0.12	2.82	2.52	-0.30	2.59	2.08	-0.51	2.42	2.24	-0.18	2.70	2.46	-0.24
Tempe	0.97	0.97	0.00	0.92	0.92	-0.01	0.89	0.91	0.02	0.95	0.95	0.00	2.75	2.69	-0.06	2.05	2.04	-0.01	2.23	2.37	0.14	2.46	2.41	-0.05
Tolleson	0.94	1.00	0.06	0.90	0.81	-0.09	0.95	1.00	0.05	0.93	0.96	0.03	3.42	3.79	0.37	2.93	2.14	-0.80	3.04	2.18	-0.86	3.33	3.47	0.14
Wickenburg	0.90	0.91	0.01	0.89	0.85	-0.03	0.74	0.78	0.04	0.86	0.87	0.01	2.39	2.51	0.12	1.79	1.87	0.09	1.58	1.56	-0.03	2.11	2.15	0.04
Youngtown	0.87	0.93	0.05	0.89	0.92	0.03	1.00	0.00	-1.00	0.88	0.92	0.04	1.70	1.87	0.17	1.44	1.48	0.05	1.00	0.00	-1.00	1.62	1.74	0.12
Unin-New River	n/a	0.86	n/a	n/a	0.71	n/a	n/a	0.92	n/a	n/a	0.87	n/a	n/a	2.80	n/a	n/a	3.42	n/a	n/a	2.17	n/a	n/a	2.73	n/a
Unin-Rio Verde	n/a	0.65	n/a	n/a	0.00	n/a	n/a	0.00	n/a	n/a	0.65	n/a	n/a	1.81	n/a	n/a	0.00	n/a	n/a	0.00	n/a	n/a	1.86	n/a
Unin-Sun City	0.86	0.83	-0.02	0.83	0.91	0.08	0.99	0.97	-0.03	0.86	0.85	-0.01	1.63	1.65	0.02	1.42	1.38	-0.05	1.37	1.40	0.03	1.62	1.60	-0.02
Unin-Sun City West	0.87	0.87	-0.01	0.58	0.80	0.22	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.87	0.86	0.00	1.80	1.77	-0.03	1.24	1.37	0.13	1.67	1.90	0.23	1.79	1.74	-0.05
Unin-Sun Lakes	0.83	0.86	0.03	0.83	1.00	0.17	1.00	0.90	-0.10	0.83	0.86	0.04	1.83	1.82	-0.01	1.23	1.32	0.08	1.33	1.56	0.22	1.82	1.79	-0.04
Unin-Other	0.89	0.92	0.04	0.84	0.84	0.00	0.61	0.68	0.06	0.80	0.84	0.04	2.73	2.86	0.12	2.07	1.94	-0.13	2.35	2.52	0.17	2.61	2.72	0.11
<b>Total</b>	0.93	0.94	0.01	0.88	0.88	0.00	0.66	0.69	0.03	0.90	0.91	0.01	2.83	2.88	0.05	2.19	2.20	0.01	2.17	2.36	0.19	2.62	2.67	0.05

\* Maricopa County portion only.

Note: An Occupancy Rate or Population per Occupied Unit of 0.00 signifies that there were no units for this unit type.

Note: "Change" value may not calculate due to rounding.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census Year 2000 Census.

Prepared by the Maricopa Association of Governments, September 2002.

**JULY 1, 2002 MUNICIPALITY POPULATION AND HOUSING UNIT UPDATE**  
**Net Housing Unit Completion and Annexation Information by Municipality (April 1, 2000 - June 30, 2002)**  
**MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

**TABLE 4**

Jurisdiction	Net Housing Units (Completions - Demolitions)					Annexed Housing Units			
	Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Total		Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Total
Apache Junction *	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
Avondale	3,672	0	34	3,706		2	0	0	2
Buckeye	135	316	58	509		12	0	0	12
Carefree	117	38	0	155		0	0	0	0
Cave Creek	144	0	1	145		0	0	0	0
Chandler	5,236	1,900	0	7,136		23	0	0	23
El Mirage	3,960	0	0	3,960		0	0	5	5
Fountain Hills	583	142	0	725		0	0	0	0
Gila Bend	6	0	7	13		0	0	0	0
Gila River	10	0	0	10		0	0	0	0
Gilbert	7,780	622	0	8,402		2	0	0	2
Glendale	2,031	1,404	0	3,435		2	0	0	2
Goodyear	3,231	0	0	3,231		0	0	0	0
Guadalupe	24	0	0	24		0	0	0	0
Litchfield Park	18	0	0	18		0	0	0	0
Mesa	8,873	3,195	188	12,256		431	0	0	431
Paradise Valley	181	0	0	181		0	0	0	0
Peoria *	4,846	921	77	5,844		0	0	0	0
Phoenix	10,569	7,461	9	18,039		9	0	0	9
Queen Creek *	364	0	0	364		0	0	0	0
Salt River	73	0	18	91		0	0	0	0
Scottsdale	3,956	2,424	0	6,380		2	0	0	2
Surprise	7,012	0	40	7,052		0	0	0	0
Tempe	127	250	0	377		0	0	0	0
Tolleson	21	0	0	21		0	0	0	0
Wickenburg	83	0	0	83		3	0	0	3
Youngtown	0	153	0	153		0	0	0	0
Unin-New River	42	0	19	61		0	0	0	0
Unin-Rio Verde	60	0	1	61		0	0	0	0
Unin-Sun City	260	0	16	276		0	0	0	0
Unin-Sun City West	18	0	83	101		0	0	0	0
Unin-Sun Lakes	577	0	2	579		0	0	0	0
Unin-Other	5,218	5	1,377	6,600		-486	0	-5	-491
<b>Total</b>	<b>69,227</b>	<b>18,831</b>	<b>1,930</b>	<b>89,988</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

\* Maricopa County portion only.

Sources: Maricopa Association of Governments Residential Completion database.

Prepared by the Maricopa Association of Governments, September 2002.

# JULY 1, 2002 MUNICIPALITY POPULATION AND HOUSING UNIT UPDATE

TABLE 5

## MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

Jurisdiction	Total Resident Housing Units (July 1, 2002)				Occupied Resident Housing Units (July 1, 2002)				Population (July 1, 2002)					
	Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Total	Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Total	Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Pop. In Households	Pop. in Grp. Qrts.	TOTAL
Apache Junction *	0	185	143	328	0	89	74	163	0	155	118	273	0	273
Avondale	12,273	1,581	1,273	15,127	11,783	1,234	1,183	14,199	40,204	3,149	4,111	47,465	146	47,611
Buckeye	1,431	767	667	2,865	1,351	711	577	2,639	4,624	1,566	1,535	7,726	4,230	11,956
Carefree	1,721	201	2	1,924	1,359	146	2	1,506	2,935	208	5	3,148	0	3,148
Cave Creek	1,593	181	124	1,898	1,460	155	85	1,700	3,486	360	176	4,023	0	4,023
Chandler	56,021	15,569	2,161	73,751	53,836	13,388	1,835	69,059	158,548	29,970	5,015	193,533	856	194,389
El Mirage	5,587	322	1,218	7,127	5,120	273	352	5,744	18,697	960	989	20,646	0	20,646
Fountain Hills	8,685	2,531	0	11,216	7,719	1,537	0	9,257	18,911	2,672	0	21,582	159	21,741
Gila Bend	434	100	245	779	373	88	209	670	1,037	254	724	2,015	0	2,015
Gila River	537	39	119	695	521	33	85	639	2,309	119	267	2,695	45	2,740
Gilbert	41,086	4,191	134	45,411	39,457	3,866	127	43,449	124,561	8,610	405	133,576	66	133,642
Glendale	53,957	24,179	4,968	83,104	52,505	21,950	4,498	78,953	162,760	50,938	10,939	224,637	2,857	227,494
Goodyear	9,110	575	317	10,002	8,298	522	317	9,137	22,045	1,319	807	24,171	2,545	26,716
Guadalupe	995	93	120	1,208	931	90	111	1,132	4,577	238	510	5,325	0	5,325
Litchfield Park	1,547	104	0	1,651	1,442	83	0	1,525	3,606	214	0	3,820	30	3,850
Mesa	104,761	50,391	33,236	188,388	97,913	43,568	16,724	158,206	294,438	97,116	32,046	423,600	3,949	427,549
Paradise Valley	5,658	15	7	5,680	5,178	15	7	5,200	14,023	30	23	14,076	12	14,088
Peoria *	38,238	5,968	4,208	48,414	36,402	4,965	3,259	44,626	105,339	8,847	6,900	121,086	1,568	122,654
Phoenix	322,153	169,922	21,805	513,880	311,616	152,071	19,066	482,753	940,684	352,358	49,852	1,342,895	22,791	1,365,686
Queen Creek *	1,350	0	243	1,593	1,290	0	228	1,518	4,492	0	848	5,340	94	5,434
Salt River	1,106	15	1,496	2,617	1,094	15	933	2,043	4,800	43	1,835	6,679	50	6,729
Scottsdale	75,259	35,080	1,017	111,356	66,931	28,391	829	96,151	161,302	49,413	1,695	212,411	1,677	214,088
Surprise	19,068	1,378	2,866	23,312	16,096	829	1,492	18,417	39,943	1,724	3,334	45,001	124	45,125
Tempe	36,849	27,870	2,726	67,445	35,858	25,620	2,478	63,955	96,155	52,116	5,874	154,145	5,280	159,425
Tolleson	1,186	280	40	1,506	1,186	227	40	1,453	4,478	485	87	5,050	0	5,050
Wickenburg	1,587	594	596	2,777	1,446	507	467	2,420	3,550	950	727	5,227	271	5,498
Youngtown	1,236	690	10	1,936	1,145	637	0	1,782	2,121	936	0	3,057	238	3,295
Unin-New River	4,011	17	547	4,575	3,457	12	506	3,975	9,691	41	1,098	10,830	45	10,875
Unin-Rio Verde	1,228	0	1	1,229	800	0	0	800	1,488	0	0	1,488	0	1,488
Unin-Sun City	23,657	4,248	102	28,007	19,742	3,883	98	23,723	32,522	5,345	137	38,004	668	38,672
Unin-Sun City West	16,282	1,085	93	17,460	14,134	869	93	15,096	24,898	1,192	170	26,260	261	26,521
Unin-Sun Lakes	7,262	73	990	8,325	6,210	73	894	7,177	11,304	96	1,392	12,791	0	12,791
Unin-Other	34,557	2,648	17,428	54,633	31,959	2,284	11,864	46,107	90,916	4,443	29,867	125,225	490	125,715
<b>Total</b>	<b>890,425</b>	<b>350,892</b>	<b>98,902</b>	<b>1,340,219</b>	<b>838,611</b>	<b>308,131</b>	<b>68,432</b>	<b>1,215,173</b>	<b>2,410,445</b>	<b>675,867</b>	<b>161,486</b>	<b>3,247,798</b>	<b>48,452</b>	<b>3,296,250</b>

\* Maricopa County portion only.

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding

Prepared by the Maricopa Association of Governments, September 2002.

**JULY 1, 2002 MUNICIPALITY POPULATION AND HOUSING UNIT UPDATE**  
**Occupancy Rates and Population per Occupied Housing Unit by Municipality**  
**MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

TABLE 6

Jurisdiction	Occupancy Rates (July 1, 2002)					Population per Occupied Unit (July 1, 2002)			
	Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Total		Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Total
Apache Junction *	0.00	0.48	0.52	0.50		0.00	1.74	1.59	1.67
Avondale	0.96	0.78	0.93	0.94		3.41	2.55	3.48	3.34
Buckeye	0.94	0.93	0.87	0.92		3.42	2.20	2.66	2.93
Carefree	0.79	0.72	1.00	0.78		2.16	1.43	2.50	2.09
Cave Creek	0.92	0.86	0.68	0.90		2.39	2.32	2.08	2.37
Chandler	0.96	0.86	0.85	0.94		2.94	2.24	2.73	2.80
El Mirage	0.92	0.85	0.29	0.81		3.65	3.52	2.81	3.59
Fountain Hills	0.89	0.61	0.00	0.83		2.45	1.74	0.00	2.33
Gila Bend	0.86	0.88	0.85	0.86		2.78	2.89	3.46	3.01
Gila River	0.97	0.85	0.71	0.92		4.43	3.61	3.14	4.22
Gilbert	0.96	0.92	0.95	0.96		3.16	2.23	3.19	3.07
Glendale	0.97	0.91	0.91	0.95		3.10	2.32	2.43	2.85
Goodyear	0.91	0.91	1.00	0.91		2.66	2.53	2.55	2.65
Guadalupe	0.94	0.97	0.93	0.94		4.91	2.64	4.59	4.70
Litchfield Park	0.93	0.80	0.00	0.92		2.50	2.58	0.00	2.51
Mesa	0.93	0.86	0.50	0.84		3.01	2.23	1.92	2.68
Paradise Valley	0.92	1.00	1.00	0.92		2.71	2.00	3.29	2.71
Peoria *	0.95	0.83	0.77	0.92		2.89	1.78	2.12	2.71
Phoenix	0.97	0.89	0.87	0.94		3.02	2.32	2.61	2.78
Queen Creek *	0.96	0.00	0.94	0.95		3.48	0.00	3.72	3.52
Salt River	0.99	1.00	0.62	0.78		4.39	2.87	1.97	3.27
Scottsdale	0.89	0.81	0.82	0.86		2.41	1.74	2.04	2.21
Surprise	0.84	0.60	0.52	0.79		2.48	2.08	2.23	2.44
Tempe	0.97	0.92	0.91	0.95		2.68	2.03	2.37	2.41
Tolleson	1.00	0.81	1.00	0.96		3.78	2.14	2.18	3.48
Wickenburg	0.91	0.85	0.78	0.87		2.45	1.87	1.56	2.16
Youngtown	0.93	0.92	0.00	0.92		1.85	1.47	0.00	1.72
Unin-New River	0.86	0.71	0.92	0.87		2.80	3.42	2.17	2.72
Unin-Rio Verde	0.65	0.00	0.00	0.65		1.86	0.00	0.00	1.86
Unin-Sun City	0.83	0.91	0.96	0.85		1.65	1.38	1.40	1.60
Unin-Sun City West	0.87	0.80	1.00	0.86		1.76	1.37	1.82	1.74
Unin-Sun Lakes	0.86	1.00	0.90	0.86		1.82	1.32	1.56	1.78
Unin-Other	0.92	0.84	0.68	0.84		2.84	1.94	2.51	2.71
<b>Total</b>	0.94	0.88	0.69	0.91		2.87	2.19	2.36	2.67

\* Maricopa County portion only.

Note: An Occupancy Rate or Population per Occupied Unit of 0.00 signifies that there were no units for this unit type.

Prepared by the Maricopa Association of Governments, September 2002.

## **ATTACHMENT THREE**

### **E-mail sent out to POPTAC members on October 3, 2002.**

GIS Day 2002 is November 20th! The goal and purpose of GIS Day is to educate people and demonstrate how advances in Geographic Information System (GIS) technology can better enable us to display information, understand the implications of that information and analyze problems.

Because GIS day coincides with the November meeting of the MAG Management Committee, we thought that this would be an excellent opportunity for MAG and its member agencies to call attention to our GIS achievements.

For this reason, we have decided to show case GIS maps, posters and displays from all MAG member agencies on November 20, 2002 so that the manager of your jurisdiction can see what you've been doing.

In order to assist us in making appropriate preparations for GIS day, please reply to this email with the following:

- 1) The name of your jurisdiction's GIS contact.
- 2) A description and size of any GIS maps, posters or displays that you or your GIS contact would like to show case at the MAG office on November 20th. Please respond by October 31, 2002 so that we have adequate time to determine the best layout for the GIS products to be posted.
- 3) Responses to the attached GIS survey by October 15, 2002. You may forward the questionnaire to the GIS contact or anyone else you think could provide accurate responses.

This event should make a great impression on everyone who attends. We look forward to your response and your organization's involvement in GIS Day 2002. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me or Don Worley via e-mail, or call us at (602) 254-6300.

Sincerely

Harry P. Wolfe  
Senior Project Manager

MAG Geographic Information System Questionnaire:

1. Contact information for GIS
2. GIS users and staff
  - a. Number of users\_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Number of dedicated GIS staff\_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Activities performed  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. GIS equipment
  - a. Equipment available\_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Future plans for GIS equipment  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Budget\_\_\_\_\_
4. GIS software
  - a. GIS software used\_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Future plans for GIS software  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Budget\_\_\_\_\_
5. GIS data
  - a. What data do you have and how current are the data?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Who develops and maintains this data?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Future plans for data acquisition, development and maintenance  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
  - d. Budget\_\_\_\_\_